

An Open Letter to Mellon

By ADAM COALDIGGER

Andy, you and I have gone in part to the oil gusher down south, to boost each other's game. We can. So I'm going to write you next to how to solve the difficult problem that ever comes up in the human race. I am not acting selfishly. I have preached world-rocking ideas I'm about to give you ever since Hector's pup. But between you and me, getting anywhere. Folks listen to a poor man, especially if he hasn't even got a handle to the whole, which is proven by the fact when a fellow like the Prince of Wales falls off his horse, the news comes from a million headlines. But off the top of the Woolworth line, the only person interested in the human race is the corner.

Now, with you it's different. You've got a lot of degrees. And first, you've got a whole bank roll. When you open your mouth they all listen, for nothing is so common as for a man to say "So if you act as for our show the team of Adam and me yet go thundering down the corridors of time as fast and only unhung savors of the world. For the momentous plan about the future is nothing but a distribution of wealth which makes everybody richer and no poorer."

Well, Andy, I didn't mean richer in money, but richer in happiness. When all is said, millionaires and billionaires are but money-mono-manics. The only good money is money well spent, and you fellows can spend only an insignificant part of the wealth you are riling up. The rest goes into such silly things as more machines, factories and mines, of which we have already too many, for according to your buddy, Hoover, the industries of the country are 50 per cent over-developed.

Please, Andy, imagine some poor not spending the only life he ever had, and perhaps ever will have, accumulating a million dollars worth of money. He is happy in his shirt trying to wear more than one at a time; or scraping ten thousand bolts together and then sitting up all night in fear that somebody would steal a few.

Well, Andy, that's the case of our busy rich, exactly. So many million dollars are but so many million neckties, bedsteads, shaving sticks, bricks, wheels and coffin nails. What you need, what we all need, to be really happy in the life is enough good food for our bellies, good clothes on our backs, a comfortable roof above our heads, a little surplus for travel, recreation, amusement, education and security for our declining days. That, Andy, is all we need. Anything above that is an unending source of headache, heartache and bellyache. By which I mean that the man who accumulates more than he can comfortably consume during his lifetime is a pure and unadulterated damnable who should be sent to the booby hatch as a public nuisance.

No, Andy, when I preach about the folly of money-making and money-hoarding, I'm not alone. The authorities are all on my side. So if you want your name honored by posterity as to cheat the devil at the same time, you help me organize the firm of

ANDY AND ADAM
Manufacturers and Distributors of
Milleniums and Accessories, Inc.
Now don't tell me that enterprises of this character have always failed. Don't I know it? But I also know that there never was such combination of goodie and noodle as we two represent.

Well, Andy, that's all for the day. Drop me a line and let me know how you feel about this scheme of mine. I'll tell my colleagues, Fall and Dehany, to write you too much about that trial, because bread and water don't mix with oil. Ha! ha!

Ever your friend and partner,
ADAM.

Sweet Land of Liberty

Says Samoans Were Shangaied by Navy

The issue of the civil rights of the Samoans and the abuse of naval rule in Samoa will be thrashed out by the Circuit Court of Appeals at Chicago to which the \$50,000 suit of Samuel S. Ripley of Los Angeles, Cal. against Captain Walden B. Evans, commander of the Great Training Station, has been appealed. Ripley, a native Samoan and American citizen, states that he was shangaied from Samoa by the order of Captain Evans, who had aided native chiefs in their grievances against the American regime to Washington. At Nov. 5 before Federal Court Judge C. Evans was rendered. Ripley charges that after he had been appointed to Washington authorities appointed the chiefs of Samoa to their naval administrators, he was ordered from London at Pago Pago by Captain Evans, who called him a dangerous trouble-maker and a person on a ship for seven months, while it sailed to Australia. Ripley, finally landed in the United States. The American Civil Liberties Union has been supporting his case against the right of Samoans to be shangaied through any agent of the United States government. Chicago are attorneys for the Union.

I. W. W. Member To Be Deported

The deportation of James Olson, Los Angeles I. W. W. member, is being fought by the Northern California Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, which will appeal to the U. S. District Court. Deportation papers had been served on Olson by the U. S. Department of Labor, according to Industrial Solidarity of Seattle. Olson is now at liberty under \$2,000 bail. Together with eight other I. W. W. members, Olson was convicted of criminal syndicalism and sentenced to five years by Judge Thomas L. Woodwine of Los Angeles in December 1921. Deportation proceedings were brought against him at the time of his conviction. Upon release from San Quentin prison last February he was served with the deportation warrant.

Start Drive On Syndicalism Law

A drive for the repeal of the California criminal syndicalism law in the coming session of the state legislature has been started by the Northern California Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union. In a pamphlet issued by the Committee the law is called an unconstitutional attack on the right of free speech and thought. Post-war hysteria is held to be the cause for this measure, which "has brought disgrace upon the state of California." Among the prominent people who assailed the law in the pamphlet are David Starr Jordan, Orrin K. McMurray, Chester Rowell, Bishop Edward L. Parsons, the Rev. John A. Ryan and Dr. Carl C. Patton.

Stocks are feeling the bottom going, and are gradually making their way to disappearance. Well, it may mean ruin for many, but it will relieve the whole people of a big burden.

With the Workers Around the World

Scotland

The London Daily Herald reports that full returns from the municipal elections in Scotland make the Labor victory even greater than the returns from England and Wales indicated. Labor has won 54 seats in Scottish boroughs and lost seven, making the net gains in Scotland 47, and raising the total gains in Great Britain to 200.

The principal gains were: Glasgow, 8; Edinburgh, 4; Motherwell, 4; Prestonpans, 3; Hamilton, 3; Lochgelly, 2; Loanhead, 2; Greenock, 2; Musselburgh, 2.

Labor now has 51 members in Glasgow council, against 62 old party "Moderates."

Mexico

The Mexican Federation of Labor (commonly known as the "Crom," an abbreviation for the initials of its name in Spanish) now numbers, according to statistics given by Ricardo Trevino, its secretary, some 2,000,000 industrial and farm workers. There are over 2,200 industrial unions and over 2,700 rural organizations. Local groups of workers and farmers from every part of Mexico are making urgent appeals for more public education; hence, the 1927 budget provides for the increase of rural schools to 3,000, not only will the number of schools and teachers be increased; education will also be reorganized so as to place elementary instruction on a basis of four-year courses, which will be carried on together with the practical industrial and agricultural education now being imparted.

Switzerland

The Social Democratic Party of Switzerland will soon be inside the National Council. At the national convention held in Neuchâtel, Nov. 6 and 7, passed a motion calling for affiliation. This leaves the Norwegian Labor Party, and the Maximalist Socialist Party of Italy as the only Socialist parties of any particular account still remaining outside the International.

The delegates voted to intensify the Socialist campaign against militarism and to fight for a number of important issues of international importance. Holding 12 of the 135 seats in the National Council of the Swiss Confederation and with its party organization functioning very efficiently, the Swiss Social Democracy is one of the strongest labor parties in Europe, and its course has always been marked by hard common sense, combined with idealism. While clinging to revolutionary principles, it has not allowed itself to be side-tracked either to the Right or to the Left. Its steady growth in membership and power shows how its stand is appreciated by the Swiss workers.

China

Tremendous victories mark the march of the great Chinese Revolution. Cantonese troops have captured Anking, capital of the province of Anhwei, and shattering the militarist armies there. This throws another province into the Kuomintang on its victorious march down the Yangtze river to Shanghai, the great labor and radical center of China.

A consular telegram from Ithaca reports that Gen. Yang, former ally of the Kuomintang, is being driven back to the eastern part of Szechwan province, definitely has gone over to the Cantonese. He has 50,000 troops, including 12,000 around Shanghai province, near which fighting has been reported.

Gen. Yang's defeat in gives all Szechwan to the Cantonese, also clearing the flanks and giving freedom of action against Marshal Wu Peifu's forces in Honan province. The Kuomintang's unparalleled victory of labor is following these victories in the popular provinces of China. The workers are being prepared as rapidly as possible for self-government in the new Socialist republic of China.

Norway

Oslo, Norway, Nov. 29.—The council of the Norwegian Labor party has decided to drop the party's extreme aims, such as nonparliamentary tactics and inviolable constitution, and to join the old Socialist party. This turn is the most important development for years in Norwegian political life.

The Norwegian labor party, has as its leader Martin Tranmæ, comprising the majority of the Norwegian workers, was expelled from the party at the last election. Its union with the Socialists will obtain for it some of the best men from the previous radical movement. The final dropping of its ultra-revolutionary methods substituted by the adoption of the new party, thus making it the most dangerous rival to the conservative party at the coming elections.

Russia

The extent of Socialization in Russia is indicated by figures for the general turnover of trade for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1926. State undertakings, \$5,725,000,000, or 50.1 per cent; private undertakings, \$2,555,411,500, or 23.9 per cent; co-operatives, \$2,818,577,500 or 24.7 per cent. The co-operatives are just as much a part of the socialization process in Russia as the government undertakings. True co-operation is a fundamental principle of collectivism. The ideal is the Cooperative Commonwealth. It is significant that there is a country in the world today as large as Russia where three-fourths of the industry and trade is operated by the state and co-operatives.

Wages, according to Moscow reports, are going up. Wage increases in the metal, coal, textile and other branches of industry where wages have lagged have been approved by the council of people's commissars. Railway employees will also get higher pay. The maximum increase will be 10 per cent and will be given to the lowest-paid groups, after study of their collective agreements with the

state, says the Tass news agency report.

Radio sets in the Soviet Union are being put into use at the rate of 25,000 a month. Many are equipped with loud speakers and serve as the village newspapers. Several million people listen in every town when the radio newspaper is broadcasted from Moscow and other centers. The elaborate art and music programs of Moscow are similarly broadcasted to the provinces.

Try To Use New Watson-Parker Law For Company Union

Railroad Would Exclude Real Union Under Measure Promoted by Labor

WASHINGTON.—The Watson-Parker Law, actively promoted and passed largely through the influence of organized labor in the last Congress, is to be used as a cloak to protect company unions and destroy real unions, of the big employing interests, have their own way.

A real test is coming soon as a result of the stand of the Pennsylvania railroad.

Determination of Pres. Atterbury of the Pennsylvania and his fellow railroad managers to break the solidarity of the 21 rail labor organizations who are insisting that the companies live up to the provisions of the Watson-Parker law, turns upon the issue of company unions and real unions. The managers, according to a formal report made to the Intl. Assn. of Machinists by Vice-Pres. Conlon, are seeking to split off the Big Four brotherhood of train crews from the rest of the transportation union. For the Locomotive Engineers, the Locomotive Firemen, the Conductors and the Trainmen the companies will grant regional adjustment boards. There are no company unions in train service. But to the rest of the rail workers there is offered a chilling prospect. There are 64 company unions in the shops of the roads that beat the federated shop crafts in the strike of 1922.

"We on the Pennsylvania," says Atterbury in an address, "are engaged in a fight on union domination, and we win. Our men, like others, get strange ideas and delusions during the war. They now feel, and they felt before the war, that they are part of the railroad, and that they are entitled to a share in its management. We are described by Conlon in his report, the shopmen's unions face a real test when the Watson-Parker law is passed. They began forming company adjustment boards of company unions. Then, when the real union filed their applications, on July 1, for creation of adjustment boards by regions, the action men managers replied that they had already agreed to deal with the company unions on a system basis.

Last August the heads of the 21 standard transportation labor organizations elected a committee of four to confer with a like committee of the managers on the adjustment board system. The committee has just met in Cleveland, but has issued no report. Johnson of the Locomotive Engineers, Wharton of the Machinists, Fitzgerald of the Railroad Clerks and Vail of the Marine Engineers are the committee men.

L. I. D. Joins The Battle For Government Ships

NEW YORK.—Continuation of the government's ownership and operation of a merchant marine was recommended by the U. S. House of Representatives committee on the League for Industrial Democracy at the board's final hearing on what to do about this country's shipping.

Present economic conditions are against successful private shipping control, the League argument stated. "This is proved statistically by an examination of capital charges and operating costs and by insularization of the disadvantage of American ships in competition for return cargo." The League holds. It points to an actual steady decrease in the number of privately owned American ships operated in foreign trade.

"Workers are better off under government ownership and management of the League holds. Many labor leaders favor government ownership.

Danish Election Prospects Good For Socialists

COPENHAGEN.—The Danish Socialist government, which holds a position similar to that of the British Labor government in 1924, has thrown down the gauntlet of battle to the old parties and dissolved the parliament for the purpose of calling a new general election.

The Socialist party held office so far only with the support of the so-called Radical party, which is a left wing old party. Together they had a bare majority in the lower house of parliament, while the upper house is ruled by the Conservative and Farmer's parties.

The Socialist government included a capital levy and plans for public loans to industries. The Radicals found this program too radical and balked at it.

Call Levy Justified.

The Danish Socialist party considers a capital levy justified. They plan to raise about \$25,000,000 by a special tax on all estates valued at more than \$12,500.

We Won the Election

The great lesson of the election that is coming every week to the Appeal office is that a most encouraging Socialist vote was cast in the election in November, and a great deal of it, no one will ever know how much, will never be recorded or reported, because the Socialists were not organized and could not protect their vote. The Wisconsin vote, especially up state, is inspiring despite any such losses. California has astounded us all by casting a vote of about 60,000. Courages in New Mexico report a fine vote, but do not yet know what it is. The Kansas vote, although not all a Socialist vote, was most encouraging. The New York City vote and what upstate vote that has been reported is most encouraging. The near carrying of Haverhill, Mass.,—so near, in fact that the enemy had to count out many Socialist votes to win—brings back old times when the Socialists used to elect Comrade Morrill in this city.

This vote is a vote that has come to us in most cases at the mercy of bitter enemies who right now are wailing in an orgy of political corruption unparalleled in the history of our country. After Vore, after Smith of Illinois, after Daugherty, after the innumerable cases of almost unbelievable corruption of our ballot box, can we consistently expect such elements to faithfully count and report our vote? Can Socialists expect old party bosses to hold the Socialist vote sacred when they steal votes wholesale from each other? Can we hope for mercy from these thieves and corruptors when the suppression of the Socialist vote might discourage to the point of extinction Socialist efforts in America as they see it.

Happily they have counted enough of our vote to convincingly demonstrate that there are many Socialists in the United States who have stayed put through all these dreadful years of oppression, terrorism, and vast political confusion since the beginning of the World War. We know now that there are thousands in every state who cannot vote any ticket but the Socialist ticket. WE HAVE THE REAL PARTY OF OPPOSITION IN AMERICA OF ANY ELEMENT. We have the principles we have worked out in our world revolution during the past year for our comrades and for the world. We have the only thought, the only motive, the only goal, that will furnish the final answer to the hellish condition that capitalism is bringing. Reform is wrecked in America. Something fundamental is demanded for a new industrial system, the demand for the complete emancipation of the

The government says that the financial policy of the last year has raised the value of all capital property between 25 and 30 per cent, and that the rich can afford to pay higher taxes.

The plan to raise a special loan for industries has the object of solving the unemployment problem. The socialization advocated by the Socialists is the only way to get the government to do what the workers demand. The government should lead money to the capitalists in order that they may employ more workers.

Reactionaries Make Trouble.

A part of the Radical party agreed to the Socialist plan, but the reactionaries, especially in the upper house, back at the policy and threaten to defeat the government's bill.

For this reason the Socialist ranks are dissatisfied with the legislature and are turning to the voters, who are sure to send more Socialists into both houses of parliament.

Admits Attempt to Trick Miners

The recent offer of the British government to the coal strike, which the miners turned down by a majority vote of 117,000, was another trick to break the union.

A Chicago Journal of Commerce editorial exposes this bit of capitalist strategy. The new move was designed only as a blow at miner solidarity but also as a club to reduce prices on American export coal to facilitate purchases to break the British union. Says the journal:

"Operators, realizing the British situation, said there was not more hope of a settlement before the halting of the miners on the question of peace began last week than there is now. Prices on some of the American coal had climbed too high and the English buyers began to look around for ways of easing things a bit. The government was prodded into negotiating with the miners. The union leaders, hoping against hope, were led into the trick. At no time did the British mine owners participate in the conference."

Some More High American Wages

The failure of office workers to organize, thoroughly exploited by Massachusetts employers, is revealed in a report of the state department of labor on the wages of office workers. According to the report 54 per cent of these workers, including supervisory classes, receive less than \$25 a week. Nearly 30 per cent get less than \$20 a week.

The survey is comprehensive including 22,427 clerks, stenographers, accountants, bookkeepers and office employees of various kinds. These workers are employed by banks, trust companies, insurance companies, brokers, sales agencies, stores, factories and public utility corporations, the total number of establishments being 1,075.

The outstanding fact is that few women in any of the occupations get as much as \$25 a week while in a considerable number the female workers are grouped heavily below \$20 a week. The number of occupations in which male workers receive less than \$25 a week is also important.

NEWS AND VIEWS

Who Are Psychopathic?

This brings up the question, who are the more psychopathic, in this controversy?

Here are the two men of these opposite types living under social arrangements in which obviously they are getting the worst of it and somebody else is obviously getting the best of it.

One of them accepts this condition without question and tries to make the best of it for himself.

The other finds the condition, unfair, unequal and unjust and seeks to persuade others to join him in changing the condition.

Is it crazier to see possibilities of improvement than to see none?

No. 1 says he is a great believer in liberty and democracy—but he opposes any effort to apply democratic principles to industrial relations.

Is this a particular sign of sanity?

No. 2 is a firm believer in liberty and democracy and all that he asks is that the principles he advocates in government should be applied to our industrial life.

Is this a particular sign of insanity?

No. 2 believes that order will work better anywhere than disorder, system better than chaos, science better than guess work.

No. 1, while advocating order, system and science in a private business, sneers at No. 2 as an impractical dreamer.

Which is the crazier in this case?

The analogy might be carried far, but one would be tempted to back a good rule—never call a person crazy because he disagrees with you.

War Danger

There are at least five points of war danger on this planet at this writing. United States and Mexico, China and the Imperialist powers, Italy and France, Italy and Turkey, Romania. There is danger between the United States and Mexico on account of the aggressive imperialism of American capitalism; between China and the Imperialist powers, especially Great Britain, because of world imperialism and its hatred and fear of any progress toward real democracy, or Socialism; between France and Italy, because France is three or four laps ahead of Italy in colonial expansion, or imperialism. Italy was unfortunate in being born as a nation later than France, and raging Italian Fascism sees no remedy for this except to sweep France out of the way. There is danger between Italy and Turkey because Italy wants the best part of Turkey for a colony. Mussolini justifies such contemplated robbery on the ground that the rapidly increasing Italian population must find a place to live and still remain Italian, and Mussolini turns right around and sees that this increase is maintained by suppressing all information on birth control. Roumania is a danger spot because of the prospective death of its king and the prospect of a civil war, which will give Roumania's subject peoples a chance to rebel.

All these war dangers represent some phases of the class struggle between the workers and exploiters and the capitalist struggle for markets. The industrial system we live under is directly responsible for them. There can be no such thing as security of life or real civilization as long as the capitalist system exists. Holding the workers down and exploiting them is war. Military operations are only external phases of the same war. If we do not change the system in a few years we will have another world war infinitely more dreadful and destructive than the last one.

Freedom in America

Flagrant examples of thought suppression in America have come to the surface recently in the New York public school and in connection with public teaching in Washington, D. C. There is nothing new in the case of Dr. Jessie Wallace Hagen. Dr. Hagen, a prominent physician, and Miss Harriet, a prominent nurse, were accused of teaching the children of the Washington, D. C. public schools, who had had his hand in their lives, to write a definition of Socialism. These cases do, however, bring to the surface the fact that the capitalist system keeps a stranglehold on education, information and thought processes. They bring out the fact that the ruling economic interests are extraordinarily keen in sensing any thought that is oppositional to their system. It is a direct challenge to capitalism. Although our education is pretentious that their educational system presents truth in an impartial way, and under conditions consistent with a freedom of thought, the thought is not colored in our schools. Even a mild liberalism which might open avenues to Socialist thought is persecuted. There seems to be freedom and latitude to hold and discuss views on all one develops a tendency toward independent and opposing thoughts, then the thumb screws are applied. Independent thinking is not tolerated in our educational system. You are free to think only one way.

Strange Type of Mind

Take the case of General Fries in his latest poison gas attack on Dr. Flury for merely writing a definition of Socialism for a magazine. General Fries' mind works in a very peculiar way. His patriotic ranting is raised to high heat because a high school professor has the temerity to question the workings of our present industrial system. Not to see the present industrial system, which certainly has most obvious shortcomings, as the perfect and only possible system, is to Gen. Fries something reprehensible, something essentially treasonable. No one should be allowed to say a word against this system that makes millionaires, paupers, political corruptionists and criminals.

"He is using only in slightly different form, the statements of the communists," shrieks Gen. Fries, "that our form of government is bad and should be overthrown."

What does Gen. Fries get that stuff about "government" and "overthrowing"? Dr. Flury says not one word about the government or the desirability of overthrowing it. He criticized the injustices and inequalities of the industrial system, and Fries' outburst is a confession. He instinctively sees the government as the special instrument of the economic interests. He cannot separate the government in his mind from the economic system. His loyalties are not democratic but are economic. His poison gas is for those who oppose industrial injustice.

Now that the roads have been taken from the people and given to owners of automobiles, and the latter have worn them out, the people will have the joy of paying for them.

Of course many private bankers will be ruined when the crash comes. But that will mean more for those that remain. A fish eating fish cannot complain if it falls a victim.

Behind It All

Displaying exactly the same type of mind, Dr. O'Shea cries out against the Socialist and Liberal teachers in New York.

"We find that many who have been American institutions and principles are considered by eminent medical men as psychopathic."

These teachers in no instance had been American institutions and principles. They had held views more or less opposed to the injustices, inequalities and cruelties of the present industrial system.

But to this so-called educator capitalism is synonymous with Americanism and to oppose capitalism is to be unpatriotic, bad and even crazy.

What is the reason for this 100 per cent capitalist mentality and subservience on the part of these two widely different public servants?

The explanation is not difficult. CAPITALISM CONTROLS THE SOURCE OF THEIR LIVELIHOOD AND INCOME.

The average human being adapts himself to his environment. He is a product in a most complete and thorough manner to the nature of the sources of his living.

The sources of living under the present industrial system are controlled by a comparatively small class of private capitalists.

The rest of us, even high and mighty generals, school superintendents and politicians, are dependents, off from an independent source of livelihood and doing what is necessary to keep the system going.

Those of us who have the temerity to say that this arrangement is wrong, that it destroys all semblance of liberty, and who seek to point out ways in which conditions might be bettered for all are immediately branded as enemies of government, traitors and subjects for psychopathic treatment.

An Issue

Gen. Fries has demanded prompt action in the matter of his mental and threatened as an alternative that he will take the matter up with various patriotic organizations. This is a good case to watch because it will test the average mentality of patriotic organizations. If these bodies see anything in the writing of a definition of Socialism for a magazine contest to enlist their formidable activities in the high and noble service of getting a school teacher separated from his country, they are immediately branded as enemies of government, traitors and subjects for psychopathic treatment.

General Fries as head of the Chemical Warfare Service is the leader of the action against Dr. Flury. He is against the President; he is against the Secretary of State; he is against the League of Nations and the disarmament conference. He is against everything that is humane, enlightened, decent or civilized. But the American Legion is backing him, and so are the chemical interests.

This species of patriotism is so great that it would arm the potential enemies of America with poison gas in order to have the pleasure of using poison gas on them. Under the pretense of furnishing America with a great weapon of defense it would throw away the opportunity of dashing from the hands of the hands of America's potential enemies. It would thus vastly increase the danger from without to this country. And while doing this it would commit a heinous crime against humanity and civilization.

It is this kind of an element that is taking the lead in thought suppression at this moment. Socialists should feel honored that they have been singled out by such an element for attack. It is a good time for the Socialists to show their mettle. The suggestion from Joseph W. Sharts and the Dayton Socialists that Socialist locals and friendly Labor and Socialist organizations have resolutions of protest against the action of Gen. Fries is a good one.

Of course many private bankers will be ruined when the crash comes. But that will mean more for those that remain. A fish eating fish cannot complain if it falls a victim.

How The World War Undermined American Liberty

Editor's Note

Recent examples of thought suppression in our public schools and elsewhere, brings out the perpetual and supreme importance of the question of civil liberty in capitalist America.

The imminent danger of a break with Mexico when the new land and oil laws go into effect in that country the first of the coming year, over the strenuous objection of Wall Street, again makes peace an uppermost issue.

On account of the present importance of these two issues, the American Appeal management have decided to publish a most valuable contribution by Dr. Forrest R. Black of the University of Iowa on a subject vitally related to both issues—How The World War Undermined American Liberty. The World War undermined American liberty. A war with Mexico would probably destroy it. It is well to be informed and forewarned in the event of a final, irrevocable agreement will be signed, they say, favorable to the employers. The following article, however, reflects the unbroken fighting spirit of the miners' Federation, which will emerge from the fight as a strengthened industrial union and politically a solid Socialist body, ready for a harder fight when the greater test comes in the near future.

By Forrest R. Black

Government in War-Time

Before presenting the detailed evidence to show that there is a substantial denaturation of constitutional guarantees and a general pa-

ralysis of constitutional government in war-time, it is proper by way of introduction to present a general picture of the manner in which the Executive, the legislative and the judicial departments function in time of war. It is well to begin with the declaration of hostilities. Our Constitution specifically provides that Congress shall have power to declare war. In reality, this has been a mere formality in the case of our six foreign wars.

(1) The President has created a situation which has made the fact of war inevitable. Congress has been reduced to a mere legitimizing agency—its only function has been to clothe a de facto situation with the de jure habilitations and thus give it respectability.

In the second place, war having been declared, a "Psychological Gresham's law" dominates the Congress. "Just as in commerce, debased coin, if there be enough of it, must drive out the sterling, which in the contest of motives, action which responds to the more primitive feelings and impulses, to first thoughts and established prejudices" (2) must prevail. The extremist is in the saddle. He has been thrilled by the chanting of a hymn of hate. The love of war, for the sake of power, has become an obsession. Driven on by a curious combination of motives, he introduces an outrageously extreme measure, which not only violates constitutional limitations but also in effect ages war on the basis of the American tradition of tolerance and freedom.

War Madness in Power

And then comes into play a vicious

logic in the halls of Congress. The argument is made that this measure, introduced by the extremist, will help win the war. Therefore the Congress must adopt this measure. Any man who is not in favor, any man who desires to compromise, is AGAINST winning the war. It requires a high degree of moral courage and intellectual acumen to withstand the force of this appeal.

But it may be thought that this abrogation of constitutional safeguards will not succeed. Does not the Supreme court of the United States, as the ultimate defender of the Constitution, have the power to declare such an act null and void? Is not that august tribunal above the devastating demands of the mob spirit in war-time? Unfortunately (for the believer in limited government) it is not. Just as the President can bring about a situation of affairs which will compel Congress to make the formal declaration of war, so Congress, when war is once declared, can place the Supreme court in such a position that it will be judicially impotent at least in all cases where the constitutional prohibition and practice are not unequivocally definite and certain.

The position of the Supreme court in war-time is well described by a conversation that took place between an eminent member of the bar and a Justice of that court. The lawyer, having heard that a certain case, involving the validity of a war statute had been decided, but not yet known the nature of the decision, happened to meet one of the Justices in the streets of the capital city. He

inquired of his friend, what disposition had been made of this particular case, and the Justice, throwing his hands up in despair said, "What could we do but uphold the validity of the law?"

Disappearance of Law

But we do not need to rely on evidence of this character, where the names of the parties and the case can not be divulged. The courts, in their opinions, have openly admitted the existence of this tremendous pressure. Justice Davis in *Ex parte Milligan* (3) said: "During the late wicked Rebellion, the temper of the times did not allow that calmness in deliberation and discussion so necessary to a correct conclusion of a purely judicial question. THEN, considerations of safety were mingled with the exercise of power; and feelings and interests prevailed which are happily terminated. NOW that the public safety is assured, this question, as well as all others, can be discussed and decided without passion or the admixture of any element not required to form a legal judgment." In the case of *Hughes vs. Grissold*, (4) a similar view was expressed. "It is not surprising that amid the tumult of the late Civil War, and under the influence of approaches and influences of the Republic almost universal, different views, never before entertained by American statesmen or jurists, were accepted by many. The time was not favorable to considerate reflection upon the constitutional limits of legislative and executive authority. If power was assumed from patriotic

motives, the assumption found ready justification in patriotic hearts. Many who doubted, yielded their doubts, many who did not doubt were silent."

Wilson Knew Beforehand

Woodrow Wilson predicted, on the eve of America's entrance into the Great war, the slaughter of ideals and the enthronement of the mob spirit. Frank I. Cobb, late editor of the New York World was called to the White House the night before the war message was delivered to Congress. Arriving at the President's study at 1 A. M. he listened to a dramatic statement coming from the man who was to be the War President. Woodrow Wilson said in substance, "The war will overturn the world, I have no doubt. So long as we remain out, there is a preponderance of neutrality, but if we join the Allies, the world will be off the peace basis and onto a war basis. There won't be any peace standards left to work with. There will be only war standards. It will require a liberalism at home to reinforce the man at the front. The Constitution will be overturned; free speech and the right of assembly will go. A nation can't put its strength into a war and keep its head level; it has never been done." (5)

No Excuse for Wilson

Altho the scene of hostilities was three thousand miles away, the Wilson war policy was formulated in strict accord with this historic utterance. In our attempt to "make the world safe for democracy" our government deliberately utilized the methods of

autocracy. Norman Angell has said, "President Wilson did not seem to realize that the intellectual lynching which his government permitted and encouraged was bound to deprive him of the force necessary to carry his policy into effect—that force being the support of American feeling when it came to the peace. It was because that feeling turned against him that his task became too difficult." (6)

The Wilson utterance just quoted reminds one of the statement that Abraham Lincoln is reported to have made to his Secretary of the Treasury: "The South has violated the Constitution to break up the Union; I am ready to violate it to preserve the Union; and between you and me, Chase, before we get through this Constitution is going to have a rough time." (7) Lincoln was confronted by an unparalleled situation. He had no constitutional precedents to guide him, in dealing with sections which claimed to be independent states, waging war on the Federal government.

A comparison of the Civil War and the World War should convince every student of constitutional law, that President Lincoln, because of a peculiar circumstance confronting him, was entitled to exercise a greater scope of power than President Wilson in the World War. In the first place, the Civil War was a rebellion and the President has the constitutional power to suppress rebellion without waiting for Congressional sanction. In the case of a rebellion there is no need of a Congressional declaration of war. (8) The World

War was an international conflict fought on foreign soil, and the President would have no independent power unless he could show that he was repelling an invasion.

Lincoln and Wilson

Fort Sumter was fired upon April 12, 1861. Congress was not in session until July 4, 1861. President Lincoln said, "In the interval between April 12 and July 4, I have a new principle appeared in the constitutional system of the United States, namely, that of a temporary dictatorship. All the powers of government were virtually concentrated in a single department, and that department whose energies were rected by the will of a single man. (9) It is true that during this time Lincoln exercised many powers not belonging to the President. It is true that the attempt on the part of Congress to subsequently legalize what he had done, was partially effective for the reason that some of the acts were outside the scope of Congressional competence. (10) But nevertheless, the fact remains that because it was a rebellion Lincoln was entitled to exercise broader powers than President Wilson in the late war.

In the second place, considering the matter from the viewpoint of internal war power, Lincoln's constitutional power as commander in chief was much broader than Wilson's because in the Civil War the theater of hostilities was on our soil. (11)

British Miners Emerge From Fight Stronger, Says Leader

Editor's Note

Labor correspondents in Great Britain report that the strike of the million coal miners is fast, despite the vote by a considerable majority, to fight to a final, irrevocable agreement will be signed, they say, favorable to the employers. The following article, however, reflects the unbroken fighting spirit of the miners' Federation, which will emerge from the fight as a strengthened industrial union and politically a solid Socialist body, ready for a harder fight when the greater test comes in the near future.

(The following is the gist of a recent interview given by Arthur J. Cook, secretary of the Miners' Federation, to David Berger, Welsh daughter of Socialist Congressman Victor L. Berger of Milwaukee. Mrs. Welles is in England.)

"It's ending badly for the miners and the federation," Cook said. "The miners are losing the fight, but the federation is stronger than ever. It means we're going to have a reorganization. Within six months after this struggle ends we're going to begin to organize as industrial units instead of the loose federal system we have now. I believe in industrial unionism—not craft or trade unionism."

"But the men—are they moved by the long future struggle? Will they ever strike again?"

"For a moment Cook looked gray, wearier, shabbier, then he smiled. "No, the men won't feel that way about it," he declared. "If the war can be brutal, the men can be brave. They will face their own war of fighting. And we're well enough organized," he added with pride, "that they can do it. Of the 1,200,000 miners, 1,000,000 are in the federation. They all work together. You can only imagine when you've got a perfect organization."

Cook neglected his tea as his enthusiasm increased.

"We've got the strongest union in the world," he said. "But it's not that alone that made the men hold out. They couldn't bear the thought of longer hours in the mines. You people in America, you don't know what English miners are. The men would rather have a shilling pay—they'd rather have anything than stay in the mine another hour."

"Now the government and the owners are driving them back on every point for which they fought. Their wages are to be cut; they're not to have a national agreement; they'll have to go back on a seven and a half hour and eight hour day, according to how the districts decide. And if one district settlement is for eight hours, you can be sure they'll all be eight very shortly."

"Why have they kept on and on—and the terms getting worse all the while?" I asked.

"It was the one moment when Cook looked bitter.

"We'd never have started out on the struggle if we'd thought out the trade union council would let us down the way they did, in ending the general strike," he said. "That was the terrible thing. But having begun, we've got to go on—thou we can't keep it up forever—" he admitted.

"What part do you want to play in the future of the English labor movement?" I ventured to ask after

he had shown me the rooms of the Miners' Federation, with an almost childlike pride.

"I want to help to reorganize all the trade unions of Britain into industrial units," he said. "I want the men in each unit to be able to choose their own representatives to the government. The men themselves, then I believe that the power to call a general strike should be in the hands of that council. Such an industrial-organized group would be very powerful politically."

Miners All Socialists.

He added that even now the miners were very popular in London, and had no less than 25 members in the House of Commons, to whom they paid salaries from the federation political fund in addition to the salaries given by the government. "The miners are all Socialists," he said.

Mr. Cook is opposed to the concept of the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

It means, he explained, that the government is not responsible for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

He added that even now the miners were very popular in London, and had no less than 25 members in the House of Commons, to whom they paid salaries from the federation political fund in addition to the salaries given by the government. "The miners are all Socialists," he said.

Mr. Cook is opposed to the concept of the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

It means, he explained, that the government is not responsible for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

He added that even now the miners were very popular in London, and had no less than 25 members in the House of Commons, to whom they paid salaries from the federation political fund in addition to the salaries given by the government. "The miners are all Socialists," he said.

Mr. Cook is opposed to the concept of the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

It means, he explained, that the government is not responsible for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

He added that even now the miners were very popular in London, and had no less than 25 members in the House of Commons, to whom they paid salaries from the federation political fund in addition to the salaries given by the government. "The miners are all Socialists," he said.

Mr. Cook is opposed to the concept of the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

It means, he explained, that the government is not responsible for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

He added that even now the miners were very popular in London, and had no less than 25 members in the House of Commons, to whom they paid salaries from the federation political fund in addition to the salaries given by the government. "The miners are all Socialists," he said.

Mr. Cook is opposed to the concept of the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

It means, he explained, that the government is not responsible for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

He added that even now the miners were very popular in London, and had no less than 25 members in the House of Commons, to whom they paid salaries from the federation political fund in addition to the salaries given by the government. "The miners are all Socialists," he said.

Mr. Cook is opposed to the concept of the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

It means, he explained, that the government is not responsible for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

He added that even now the miners were very popular in London, and had no less than 25 members in the House of Commons, to whom they paid salaries from the federation political fund in addition to the salaries given by the government. "The miners are all Socialists," he said.

Mr. Cook is opposed to the concept of the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

It means, he explained, that the government is not responsible for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

He added that even now the miners were very popular in London, and had no less than 25 members in the House of Commons, to whom they paid salaries from the federation political fund in addition to the salaries given by the government. "The miners are all Socialists," he said.

Mr. Cook is opposed to the concept of the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight. He does not believe in the government's responsibility for the miners' fight.

hours and the men say seven hours, the men will have to work eight hours while the appeal is pending. Then, if the miners and the owners on the board have not been able to agree, a chairman and you know they won't agree, then the decision will rest with the government appointed chairman. And the meaning of that is plain."

Men Always Coincide.

"Does the rest of your organization agree with your opinion?" I asked.

"The men do, I believe," he replied. "The delegate conference is weakening. Sometimes I almost want to resign—and then I know I can't."

Cook said that the R. M. S. had sent 1,000,000 pounds for the aid of the miners, and the rest of Europe had sent something over 500,000 pounds. The trade union council by the levy which it had just voted for the support of the strikers would make it possible for the men to hold out some time longer, he declared.

"It's not settled yet. About 200,000 tons of limited minerals have been sent to work, but the rest are still out. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

So far the men have supported him wholeheartedly. After six months of half starvation, the miners are a hardy bunch with endurance. They can't give in to any such terms as these."

U. S. AND MEXICAN STAND IN PRESENT CONTROVERSY

ment issues a statement warning other nations against "interference" in Nicaragua.

This is aimed at Mexico, Diaz claims that Mexico is permitting gun-running between Mexico and Nicaragua revolutionists. A Washington dispatch also declares that evidence exists "pointing to Bolshevik influence and hinting at a possible Bolshevik combination which would further the efforts to overthrow the Central American and to ward the Panama Canal." It is added that the state department is in possession of many facts supporting all the statements.

Now the state department is said to have some justification for its attitude against interference in Nicaragua were it not for our own history on this score. The United States has itself interfered in Latin America time after time in the past 20 years and by its own admission has been guilty of interference in Nicaragua. It is

tempting to interfere when it takes the side of Diaz, an old tool of American imperialism who has just returned to power and who will not serve the Nicaraguan people but will serve as errand boy of American bankers and investors.

The "Bolshevik" charge is a screen behind which is hidden the exploiting interests of American bankers and capitalists. In the year 1929 the no-fronter the United States declared the attempt of five Latin American nations to form a federation was a "Bolshevik plot." The American protest is simply an objection to Mexican interference in behalf of the laboring class in Nicaragua and an affair of no concern to the United States.

By his assent action he caused the Washington Star to conduct an inquiry as to what is Socialism. Among others, this inquiry elicited replies from Dr. Jason Noble, pastor of the First Congregational Church, formerly referred to as the President's church; William Mather Lewis, president of the George Washington and from William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor.

Ben. Pinney's definition is as follows: "Socialism, like its antithesis, capitalism, is a much maligned theory of the ownership of all property and the division of all income. Its purpose is to better conditions of life for individuals and for society, and in consequence to promote brotherhood, justice, peace and prosperity. Its plan is, as far as practicable, to transform private property into public property, private management into public management, and to prorate the income of the community for all its members. Its problem is human nature, which is so human as to require good and incentives. Capitalism supplies these stimuli by private rewards. Socialism would be saved from anarchy only by a successful achieved religious and moral motives. The progress of Socialism is related to the progress of capitalism. These two represent at the present time undesirable extremes. The ideals of both are valuable and we appropriate somewhat of both. In place of our ownership of private and public property, let the management of private and public business. The end of both capitalism and Socialism is man's welfare, and the largest detriment of that under any system is man's character."

William Mather Lewis, president of George Washington University said: "Our existing economic system of private enterprise is characteristically competitive, profit seeking and individualistic. In place of this system, Socialism would substitute collective group ownership and management of factories, railroads and other industrial enterprises. Socialism stresses existing waste of natural resources, and the hardships borne by labor, and maintains that the proper remedy is control by the Government of labor organizations or a combination of both. It is difficult to give a universally applicable definition of Socialism. In some European countries, where rewards of labor are comparatively small, the extreme Socialist, skeptical of legislative success, advocates securing control through violence. In other countries, where the

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Mr. Kellogg gives Mexico to understand that if Americans are deprived of the properties they are entitled prior to 1917, when the nationalization program was adopted, and in defiance of the understanding on which Washington recognized the Mexican government in 1923, the American government will withdraw recognition of the Mexican government.

Gen. Fries Stirs Up Socialist Discussion

The attempt of Gen. Fries, chief American advocate of prison gas warfare, to suppress any expression of Socialist thought has had exactly the opposite effect in Washington, D. C. It has made Socialism an issue there and caused a public discussion of Socialism that has represented anything of the kind for years.

By his assent action he caused the Washington Star to conduct an inquiry as to what is Socialism. Among others, this inquiry elicited replies from Dr. Jason Noble, pastor of the First Congregational Church, formerly referred to as the President's church; William Mather Lewis, president of the George Washington and from William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor.

Ben. Pinney's definition is as follows: "Socialism, like its antithesis, capitalism, is a much maligned theory of the ownership of all property and the division of all income. Its purpose is to better conditions of life for individuals and for society, and in consequence to promote brotherhood, justice, peace and prosperity. Its plan is, as far as practicable, to